

Appl. No. 09/945,456

12606-1

REMARKS

Claims 5-9 are in this application. By this amendment, claim 5 has been amended, and claims 10-12 have been added. Re-examination, reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested. No new matter is added.

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Hong for the courtesies that were extended to the undersigned during a telephone interview on April 8, 2003, in which the Legal Anywhere Collaborator reference was discussed as applied to claims 5-7.

Claim 5 has been amended to explicitly recite that at least some of the practitioners are of different subscribers to the same the main document database. Support for the amendment to claim 5 is found in the specification at page 3, lines 25-27, page 4, lines 3-6, page 5, lines 6-9 and 29-32, and page 11, lines 14-22, 31 and 32.

Support for the new claim 10 is found in the specification at page 5, lines 11 and 12, page 6, lines 17-19, and page 14, lines 8-12. Support for the new claim 11 is found in the specification at page 11, lines 14-21. Support for the new claim 12 is found in the specification at page 13, the sentence continuing to page 14, line 3, and page 14, lines 8-12.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over the Legal Anywhere Collaborator reference (LAC herein). It was suggested that LAC teaches maintaining a main document database, registering practitioners, processing document selections of practitioners to identify respective home document sets, identifying requesting

Appl. No. 09/945,456

12606-1

users as clients of the practitioners, processing client requests and transmitting requested pages of home document sets to particular clients, maintaining practitioner-specific and client-specific databases and including practitioner-specific and client-specific portions of the database in pages transmitted to clients, maintaining client data and tracking client access to the home document sets. It was further suggested that it would be obvious to have the processing occur from the main document database.

In the above-referenced telephonic interview, the Examiner further suggested that the main document database could be that of a single law practice, the practitioners being attorneys of that practice.

It is believed that the rejection of claims 5-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103 is no longer appropriate in view of the amendment of claim 5 requiring at least some of the practitioners to be affiliated with different specific practices of subscribing entities having access to the main document database. It is noted that different subscribers disclosed in the LAC reference contribute separate collections of documents that are not generally available to other subscribers. Thus, although the practitioners of a single subscriber of LAC may have access to all of the documents of that subscriber, they do not have access to the documents of other subscribers except to the extent authorized by the other subscribers.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejected claims are non-obvious in view of the references in that none of the references discloses or suggests Applicants' maintenance of a main document database from which practitioners of different entities select home document sets for access by clients of those practitioners. In other words, a particular client is restricted to documents selected by his practitioner from the same main document set that a practitioner

Appl. No. 09/945,456

12606-1

of a different specific practice also has full access to for selecting his own subset (home document set) available to his clients. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claim 5 as amended.

The dependent claims are also believed allowable based on allowance of claim 5 and because they further limit allowable subject matter. Further regarding claims 6 and 7, nothing in the LAC reference discloses or suggests insertion of practitioner-specific and/or client-specific information *in pages of home document sets* that are selected from a main document database by practitioners to be accessible by clients of the practitioners. Further regarding claims 8 and 9, it is believed that the term "tracking and storage" in the LAC reference fails to disclose or suggest Applicant's *maintaining client statistics* (claim 8), and it is unclear whether "tracking" in the LAC reference means *tracking client access* (claim 9).

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection of claims 5-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103 has been overcome by the amendment and remarks; allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

Allowance of new claims 10-12 is requested based on allowance of claim 5 from which they depend, and because they further limit allowable subject matter.

In view of the above, it is believed that this application, including each of the claims 1-12, is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully requested. If for some reason

Appl. No. 09/945,456

12606-1

the Examiner considers otherwise, it is respectfully requested that a telephone call be placed to the undersigned so that issuance of a patent can be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

SHIELDON & MAK

Date: 15 April 2003

By

Stephen R. Secombe

Stephen R. Secombe

Reg. No. 31,136

225 South Lake Avenue, 9th Floor
Pasadena, California 91101
(626) 796-4000